FELLOWSHIP

July 1944 Vol. X—No. 7

Should Pacifists Approve International Police?

Two Differing Views

By VERNON NASH and THEODORE PAULLIN

•

The Doctrine of Necessary Evil

A Discussion of Dr. Morrison's Position on War

By GEORGE M. GIBSON

•

Russia in World Affairs

By A. J. MUSTE

I do not believe that the only commanding power in the world is that of military force. . . . Governments make treaties in which they agree . . . to send armies and navies, to sacrifice treasure and life, and no one stops to ask: Will the contracting powers keep their promise; who will see that they keep their pledge? On the other hand, when governments make treaties in which they agree to submit their controversies to the decision of a court and abide the judgment thereof, immediately the question is asked: Who will enforce the judgment; where is your army and navy to carry the decree into effect? As a matter of fact, it is precisely the same thing behind . . . both treaties—the solemn pledge of the nation, only that and nothing more.

—SENATOR BORAH.

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

The conscientious objectors' problem is still with us. It is with us partly because of the nature of the problem, which will not be settled until it is settled right. But it is with us also because we have ourselves chosen to keep it with us.

* * *

When conscription came rushing upon the country in 1940 and the Selective Service Act was duly presented to Congress, we pacifists submitted and supported recommendations for the recognition of conscientious objectors to war and their assignment to useful forms of public service. To an astonishing extent our recommendations were adopted. There were serious omissions, but a considerable and vital portion of what we wanted was written into law. The situation as compared with the last war was greatly improved. There was sound reason for feeling that the pacifist agitation of the last quarter of a century had not been in vain.

Equally gratifying was the general attitude of the government in administering the Selective Service Act in relation to conscientious objectors. There were few traces of the stupidity, intolerance and sheer cruelty manifested by the government in 1917-1918. On the contrary, Washington showed impressive evidences of intelligence and good will. The administration was well aware of what we pacifists were all too prone to forget, that the main business of the government under the law was to raise an army, and, later, to fight a war. The CO problem must have seemed at times to hard-pressed men a pretty insignificant part of the business of the hour. Mistakes were made, more often from ignorance than malice—gross injustices were done, mostly by local draft boards and courts. But the central authorities were right-minded, welcomed advice and counsel, and tried to do what was reasonably possible to handle a peculiarly difficult problem with fairness to all concerned.

* * *

In this situation, there were two general policies that we pacifists could follow:

(1) On the one hand, we could discipline ourselves to friendly and fruitful cooperation with the government. Remembering that the men with whom we were dealing were not pacifists, and knew little of pacifism, we could in all sympathy of spirit do everything in our power to persuade them to an understanding of the CO's position and his rights under the law. Never forgetting that these officials were beset by a crisis which they regarded as of life-and-death concern to the nation, we could be patient and forgiving in our personal attitudes. We could win the ever-increasing friendship of the government by our never-failing friendship for the government, and therewith prove anew the spiritual truth of our pacifist faith that "love never faileth."

This attitude did not preclude our holding ourselves alert to the defense of all COs who encountered injustice and suffered wrong. With utter sweetness of temper, but with calm and stern resolution, we could seek to vindicate, by appropriate legal action, the full implications of the law in protection of COs. This has been done with a large measure of success by the American Civil Liberties Union, which established a special committee on COs and has supported this committee in its rigorous endeavors to protect COs from any slightest infringements of their legal and moral rights.

As regards the COs themselves, we could do our utmost to sustain their morale in their arduous personal experiences. We could help them to understand the heroism of their protest, and the permanent value of their witness, against war. We could teach them to rejoice in what they were called upon to endure as opportunity to make sacrifice for an ideal. In their frustrations, we could show them how even the worst lot can be transfigured by the quickening power of the inner spirit. If they were reduced to sheer inaction, swept aside and apparently forgotten, we could remind them that "They also serve who only stand and wait." We could lead these young men to peace of mind, courage of heart, exaltation of spirit, so that all would cry out, as did one in writing me from a CPS camp, "I feel that my prayer to do something for the starving world has been, in part at least, miraculously answered, and that I am right in the spot where probably more can be done than elsewhere."

(2) But there was a second policy that pacifists could follow, and many did follow, in this situation:

We could refuse to cooperate with the government. We could take an attitude of suspicion and ill-will, of complaint and bitterness of heart. We could interpret errors of judgment as evidences of bad faith, put the worst rather than the best construction upon unjust policies, and thus change honest differences of opinion into occasions of antagonism. We could manufacture arbitrary and artificial issues, such as "work of our own choosing" and "involuntary servitude," in defiance of the fact that the government, by fiat of the people, is operating under a universal conscription act which binds all men of certain age to the bondage of war-time service. We could deliberately make trouble in disregard of the all-embracing trouble in which the world is lost.

And we could cultivate unhappiness, disaffection, and recalcitrancy among the COs themselves. We could nurse every natural grievance, magnify every disappointment and passing resentment into a moral issue. We could come to sensitive, acutely conscientious, steadily brave, yet sadly confused young men, faced every one of them by a problem of adjustment that might test the strongest spirit to the breakingpoint, and encourage brooding discontent. We older pacifists, ourselves secure, could tempt these gallant fellows into ways of rebellion and martyrdom which threatened their comfort, their health, their sanity, their very lives, and then raise wild cries of protest at our own handiwork.

* * *

These were the two paths open to us when this CO problem began. They are open to us still. Some pacifists choose to walk in the first; others choose to walk in the second. The difference between the two is momentous. Nothing less than the question as to whether pacifism is, or is not, religion—a religion of patience, forgiveness, love, and inextinguishable faith in God and man!

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE *Editors*
J. ELLIOTT FINLAY *Managing Editor*

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

July 1944 Vol. X—No. 7

A clergyman points out some inconsistencies in Dr. Morrison's position concerning pacifism and the war.

The Doctrine of Necessary Evil

By GEORGE M. GIBSON *

PACIFISM owes a debt to non-pacifists, especially on two accounts—the theological and the political. Criticism by Christian and democratic non-pacifists has enabled the pacifist movement to sense many of its shortcomings, and has set it in the way toward a more realistic understanding of the human problem.

It may be assumed, also, that non-pacifists have not been entirely without inspiration from pacifists. For all the plausibility of the war-thesis, pacifism continues to disturb them with a great tension. It raises doubts and presents affirmations which will not let them alone. They continue to write about pacifism, though only of its "disintegration." Though they deny it has a leg left to stand on, yet they feint and thrust at its shadow. Not a book, article, or editorial appears from the viewpoint of non-pacifist Christians and democrats, but it takes some notice of the pacifist challenge and betrays the tension created by that challenge in the unhappy mind of modern man. For this tension the non-pacifists owe a debt to pacifism.

Mutual expressions might be in order, but for a recent editorial in the columns of *The Christian Century*,** which essays to bring mere criticism to an end by the declaration that pacifism is finished.

As a pacifist who has hoped for a closer rapprochement between these two groups of like aims but unlike methods, the writer feels impelled in these pages to make a direct answer to Dr. Morrison's continuing criticism, with special reference to the basis on which it rests, *the doctrine of necessary evil.*

That doctrine is the postulate of the whole *Christian Century* position on the war and the pacifist question. It is presented with more reiteration than proof, three times appearing by bare statement in the first three paragraphs of the editorial in question. Stated both positively and negatively, this doctrine of necessity holds "that non-participation in a going war by an individual is impossible," and "that participation is a necessity—for pacifists as well as for non-pacifists."

That pacifism survives that death-sentence, and continues its challenge of war with renewed energy, advancing its views of reconciliation in the very midst of conflict, is sufficient ground for doubting whether the doctrine of necessary evil is itself above criticism. An answer is overdue.

The answer must begin with a recognition of the partial truth that lies in the primary tenet. That there is an element of necessity in life, one would not care to deny. But this element of necessity must always be taken together with that of freedom. Christian doctrine recognizes the paradoxical character of truth, and ever presents its teachings in polar relationship. And, by the same token by which we recognize necessity we also recognize freedom. Christian doctrine presents no view of necessity *per se* any more than it does of liberty *per se.* Our very liberties are under constraint, and there is freedom even in our fatalities. An absolutized necessity is quite as eccentric to classic Christianity as an absolutized freedom would be.

It is this error that the distinguished editor falls into as though in a desperate pass to get a practical answer to the exigencies of war. He makes an absolute of the "necessities" of war, ignoring in his ideology the very liberties which he himself puts to daily practice in relation to the war. This comes out to an unrealistic end and gives us an abstraction having little to do with the actualities of the Christian citizen in war. It offends against that wholeness of view which has been the mark of the classic Christian tradition, and, more particularly, against the perpetual spiritual defiance of evil and confidence in the power of God's grace to work good despite "principalities and powers." It loses all sense of distinction and fails to discern the infinite degrees of involvement or lack of involvement possible to the individual in a war situation. It voids human behavior, relative to the war situation, of any moral meaning whatsoever—whether the behavior of those supporting or of those opposing the war.

An absolutized "necessity" creed violates the Christian view of wholeness, and offends against the dominant Christian emphasis upon the power of divine grace to triumph over the evil of natural man. It goes the way of all the theological determinisms which take no account either of the freedom of God or the liberties of man. It smacks more of the fatalistic creed of Stoicism than of the

* Minister of the United Church of Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill.
** "Pacifism Disintegrating," April 26, 1944.

Christian gospel of faith. The New Testament is full of the spirit which this thesis denies—asserting the demands of truth upon man as, created in the divine image, he is free to obey or not to obey the divine will. Even in its prison-house of time and place, Christianity addresses the human soul as though, by the grace of God through Christ, it could do all things, even rebel against the tyranny of fact. Though under the "necessities" of Roman law and Jewish custom, strong as steel, the Christian was free, none-the-less, "to obey God rather than man," and so "turned the world upside down." If he knew of the "necessities" of unregenerate political life, he was even more aware of the necessities of God. The constraint of divine grace was upon him, overcoming the commands of the state and the dilemmas of logic.

This triumphant note in the gospel need not be confused with the optimism with which modern liberalism has regarded human nature. The neo-theologians are in succession with the classic tradition of Christianity in despairing of man's power to save himself. Man's freedom is a *granted* freedom, and always held *in trust.* But, as a creature of God, redeemed by His grace, he enjoys the liberty of the gospel, and that liberty brings with it a freedom of moral action within the framework of history.

All this emphasis is somehow missed in Dr. Morrison's theology. Its low estimate of human nature is exaggerated. It sees human nature as not only incapable of saving itself (which is true), but as incapable of being saved by divine redemption. The "neccessities" of natural man are given a power greater than the power of God through Christ to work in him the "new creation." While forgiveness "upon a religious level" is recognized, it has no relation with reform upon a moral level. Grace operates in a mystic vacuum, leaving its subject "to continue in sin," with an unsanctified penitence as the highest state he can attain.

I have said "continue in sin" although Dr. Morrison would not accept this. War is *evil,* he agrees, but not *sin.* The sin that caused the judgment to fall was committed before the war. The war itself falls as a judgment of God who "condemns us to fight" because we have sinned. But now that the fighting becomes obligatory, not only under the inexorable nature of war itself, but as a divine condemnation, the citizen is henceforth exempted from responsibility. All moral significance, which loomed so large before a declaration of war, is now destroyed by the expulsive power of a great necessity. This drawing of a neat line between sin and judgment results in a moral irresponsibility that inevitably accompanies all necessitarian systems. It ignores the fact that judgment was never absent before the war, and that responsibility continues during the war, even as the judgment falls.

There is no device which may be more conveniently used in the interest of an irresponsible conscience than this doctrine of necessary evil. Sir Thomas Browne had a word for those who would shirk a responsibility by pleading necessity:

> Burden not the back of *Aries, Leo* or *Taurus,* with thy Faults, nor make *Saturn, Mars,* or *Venus,* guilty of thy Follies. Think not to fasten thy imperfections on the Stars, and so despairingly conceive thyself under a fatality of being evil.

Sound Christian theology has sensed a fallacy even in those deterministic systems which make God the author of necessity and place man under a fatality of being *good.* Any full view requires a recognition of the response of man to the divine initiative. But this war-theology comes out on a yet lower level, finding as it does, necessity in the natural order of things, and leaving the creature under "fatality of being *evil.*"

Dr. Morrison is perfectly clear as to the amorality of this position. He recognizes no moral significance in what the Christian does relative to war, simply because he recognizes no area of freedom in which he may operate. If his premise of necessity be correct, his conclusion is also right. But it is just this amoral conclusion that raises the question concerning the premise of necessity. An absolute necessity means an absolute amorality. There is neither moral significance nor responsibility in supporting the nation at war, or in attempting to withhold support. There is no merit either way, nor any accountability. All do what they must, going along with the dire fatalism of the hour, rendering taxes to whatever Caesar they may unwillingly serve. By the very fact that they are alive in a total war economy, they participate in the war.

But here, even the rigorous position of *The Christian Century* must qualify necessity with liberty. There is one choice open. The citizen in war-time may not choose whether or not he will fight; but he may choose which side he will support. He may go along with his own nation, or, under the illusion that he is not participating, he fights on the side of the enemy by withholding support from his own country. This is a concession to the liberty which the main thesis of the editor minimizes. The concession is more significant than he realizes, and profoundly qualifies the main contention if followed through in its implications.

A considerable realm of spiritual freedom is here suggested, and it is obvious that a choice made here within this realm has a direct bearing upon an individual's effectiveness. Though bound by the exigencies of the body, he is yet free in soul. He may give or withhold his moral assent; he may, as an hundred per center, give the war his fullest spiritual euthusiasm; or he may, like pacifists and the editor of *The Christian Century,* bow to the necessities reluctantly, protesting every inch of the way. A judicial principle thus qualifies necessity, and infinite degrees of effectiveness or ineffectiveness are recognized.

This spiritual freedom to give or withhold assent has more than an academic bearing upon the war. It means not only morality, but morale, and its importance is recognized by every common-sense observer. Only under an artificial and absolutized proposition of logic can the war be seen as a mechanical Frankenstein in which a democracy of necessity makes all men equal in their service or disservice. And such a doctrine ignores the most obvious facts of morale. Willingness and spiritual enthusiasm would not make a man's participation one whit more effective, nor his reluctance one whit less.

As Jacques Maritain shows in his *The Rights of Man and Natural Law,* man is not wholly a citizen. In the larger part of his being he transcends citizenship, having rights and duties independent of any claims of the state. He belongs not wholly to any nation, but to humanity, the universe, and to God. Christian thought considers it to be the very essence of tyranny when that which by nature transcends the state, is claimed by the state. And by the same token, Christian thought holds that the grant of

allegiance to such a claim would be state-idolatry.

Here, then, is a vast area of freedom not properly taken into account by the author of the doctrine of necessity. It has been seen, further, that decisions taken in this area have a very definite practical bearing upon the actual behavior of the citizen, even in his citizenship capacity. The endless variety of services and disservices is ignored by the theory of absolutized necessity. No basis is offered for a true appraisal of those main distinctions: (1) that between the Christian and the non-Christian non-pacifist; (2) that between the Christian and the non-Christian pacifist; (3) that between the Christian pacifist and the Christian non-pacifist; and (4) that between the non-Christian non-pacifist and the non-Christian pacifist. All these, and many other distinctions are entirely blurred out under the artificial equalitarianism of the necessitarian creed.

As a matter of plain fact, Dr. Morrison sees and practices many important liberties not taken into account in his thesis. He recognizes that, though "condemned to fight," one may yet fight self-righteously or fight penitently. Now this is a tremendous concession to freedom, and one that deserves more formal treatment than the editor has given it. It will raise a question as to how effectively a man fights if he fights "penitently"; or whether he fights at all if his penitence is genuine. At any rate, it would be a poor grade of penitence that would make no difference at all.

Further, Dr. Morrison himself has effectively rejected his dogma in his position on the place of the Church in a warring world. Indeed, there has been no single force in American Christianity that has served more valiantly in maintaining non-participation for the Church, than the voice of the editor of *The Christian Century*. The Church, according to his well known stand, may not and by its nature cannot declare war nor participate in it as a belligerent. It is supernational, universal in its given character, and may not compromise its redemptive concern for all mankind by the partisanship of war.

But when the editor considers the individual Christian he completely reverses his position, and recognizes no transcendent reference-point from which such an individual can, in any sense, remain above the battle. Thus, he presents two distinct views, one of non-participation by the Church, and one of necessary participation by the Christian. To take his argument for the non-participation of the Church in war, and to substitute the term "Christian" whenever "Church" appears, would be to establish a pacifist position with great clarity and force. Or, it would be just as reasonable to substitute the word Church for Christian in the argument for necessity, and thus demonstrate that the Church, in trying to remain out of the conflict, only serves to aid the enemy.

This inconsistency may not be saved by using the Church only in the sense of "the Body of Christ," a mystical entity of super-historical character, while the individual Christian is referred to only in his citizenship capacity. The Church, as well as the Christian, is both corporal and transcendent. And Dr. Morrison himself insists that it is the corporal as well as the transcendent Church that cannot engage in war. To this end he opposes such pronouncements in councils, as would put the Church on one side of the struggle. Every argument he has advanced on this point could be presented with equal validity concerning the individual Christian. Or, on the other hand, if the law of necessity holds for the individual, it holds also for the visible Church. The editor must resolve this inconsistency if he would save his logic; he must either affirm that in maintaining non-participation the Church aids the enemy, or deny his dogma that the individual Christian is limited to that tragic dilemma.

We have freely conceded that there is some truth in the doctrine of necessity. Pacifists certainly recognize the *fact* of war, and Dr. Morrison's emphasis should bring their souls greater anguish for such degree of "necessary participation" as they must give by simply being alive in this kind of world. But we do not see that a recognition of the relative exigencies of war invalidates a pacifist commitment or entirely dispenses with the methods of reconciliation for the duration. Our objection is to the absolutism of necessity with which the editor seeks to bring all pacifist persuasions to an abrupt end. Such a view would commit every Christian in advance to every conflict and quarrel on one side or the other, and that without moral significance but only through pressure of unavoidable necessity.

This is war-talk, and not a considered Christian theology. Every partisan in every quarrel has always charged the non-participant with "aiding the enemy." The neutral, for instance, has no standing with the Nazi's; and the creative peacemaker has always been subject to the accusations of both sides that he aids the other. Thus even Jeremiah was considered a traitor to his nation and a friend of Babylon.

"We Want Peace Now, as Always"

Statement of FOR National Council, May 30, 1944

As a fellowship of pacifists we are committed never to sanction war and never voluntarily to support it. The Fellowship of Reconciliation is convinced that at any given moment of history, peace is preferable to armed conflict. We make no exception of the present moment. Before the outbreak of the present struggle, we sought to remove the conditions and the attitudes which led to war, especially in ourselves and in our own nation. We have not ceased to hope, pray, and work for peace. We want peace now, as always.

We believe that true peace must be based squarely upon full recognition of guilt for the present war shared by all peoples. Likewise, peace-making must be directed realistically to those basic causes of war common to us all. Since we are convinced that a peace made among equals can meet these tests and that a dictated peace cannot, we have all along urged official efforts for peace. We advocate such action now.

We seek a "peace without victory" for the reasons so clearly enunciated by President Wilson in his famous speech to the United States Senate in January 1917. There are no issues before mankind, including the curbing of tyranny, which cannot be more effectively solved in peace than by war. We especially believe that the achievement of social and economic justice on a national, or an international, scale can thus be more surely and quickly achieved.

Peace, not invasion, is the hope of civilization today. The least our governments can do, if we are not to risk the early loss of all we cherish, is to open peace negotiations looking toward the termination of this tragic conflict. As conscientious objectors we go further: we would heartily welcome immediate unilateral cessation of hostilities.

World Government Requires World Police

—but there must first be general disarmament and the police must operate constructively upon individuals, and not destructively upon collective units

Says VERNON NASH*

POLICE, say our dictionaries, are agents of government, charged with the enforcement of law and the maintenance of order. This definition corresponds with approved practice in all well-governed countries.

In the current popular term, "international police force," the word is being used in a perverted sense by most writers and speakers. They postulate no government to control such police; and without world government there can be no true international law to be enforced.

What is being generally proposed is, in effect, a scheme for assembling an international vigilante band, if possible, at each threat of war. It is assumed that needed military contingents would be contributed by nations that would remain heavily armed. May I note, in passing, that this type of "peace alliance" has never proved dependable anywhere in human history. It is impracticable, even if there were no graver objections to it.

I favor a real international police power under a representative world authority possessing unchallengeable ability to control national armaments. I would be just as uncompromising a CO to world vigilante-ism as I am to war. Such so-called world police methods actually would establish war as the one available means of enforcing the decisions of a world organization. The one feasible and acceptable alternative is to disarm all nations down to such light-armed forces as may be required in each country for the maintenance of internal order. The final decisions about the size and equipment of such militia forces must be made by the world federation.

It is widely urged that we must be ready and willing at all times to make war in order to save peace. That surely is an outright contradiction in terms; peace would be lost each time just as soon as an international constabulary moved against any corporate, organized society of men. Does it follow then that force cannot be used in world affairs, either wisely or legitimately? Are we warranted in saying that force is not needed to preserve peace? To stress the quite generally admitted fact that force *alone* cannot maintain the right kind of peace is not at all equivalent to saying that force is completely unnecessary.

A pacifist is justified in ruling out force in international relations, in my judgment, only if he is convinced that *all* uses of physical coercion are unwise and wrong, anywhere and everywhere. We may rightly make the same demands concerning uses of force by a world authority which we normally make upon other governments to which we are subject, *but no more.* We do not pass into any mystical or freakish realm when we approach the problems of government on the international level. The same kind of human beings operate there, and the same types of conflict threaten harmonious relationships there which exist in our cities, states and nations. If you grant the right of public officials to use physical coercion to enforce law and thus to maintain order in your community, your state and your country under certain restrictive conditions, then intellectual consistency and moral integrity require that you approve such uses of force *under similar safeguards* on the world level.

Acceptance of these conditions drives us directly to a most critical scrutiny of the *forms* of world political organizations which have been projected. Each scheme must be considered in its entirety, and not merely with respect to its policing methods. No groups have a more vital stake at this point than do pacifists, since any loose association of nations in any league system intrinsically calls for a type of enforcement which most of us could not possibly support or approve. A league, as a confederation of fully sovereign nation-states, must of necessity apply its coercions upon countries as units—indiscriminately upon innocent as well as guilty.

If we are to have a policing power vested in a world authority along lines which most pacifists could sanction, that body must be a federation of peoples so that its laws can be made applicable to individuals and can be enforced by genuine policing methods upon individual persons. It is for this reason above all others, it seems to me, that a federal world government is the only form of international organization which a conscientious objector to war can possibly welcome or work for. Some such considerations, I take it, account for the FOR's placing as No. 1 in its "Eight Ways to Build Peace" the creation of a world government along the lines of our own American union.

If such an analogy were followed, then the police agencies of a world federal government would have a character similar to those of federal marshals, the FBI, and the Coast Guard, in our system. Their functions would be to serve warrants issued by civilian authorities, make arrests upon the bases of indictments drawn by world grand juries, carry out required inspections, patrol federal districts of the world government, and so on.

The Use of Force

The use of anything approximating military means would arise only in the event of general, organized armed resistance to the authority of the common government in any area. The U.S.A. had to meet that extreme contingency; no other full-fledged federal system has ever had a civil war. Whether I personally could take a CO position in civil strife would depend upon the conditions which precipitated it. I could not in general principle rule out *a priori* all uses of force, even of a military character, in putting down rebellion to what I considered just government. The supreme moral weakness of the United Nations at this point is that they have been using their preponderant power all along to perpetuate unwarranted disparities in privilege and opportunity among the peoples of the earth.

* Former executive secretary of the National Peace Council; lecturer and writer on world government.

Some currency has been given to the attractive suggestion that the entire issue of international policing can be obviated by making each country responsible for the enforcement of world law within its borders by the use of its own national police force. The analogy is based on Section 2 of Article VI of our Constitution, and like provisions in other national constitutions of federal systems. But in no case has a federal government left policing powers exclusively to its constituent parts. The plan has never worked well, even in smaller divisions. As trunk highways came into being and motorcars began to be widely used, most of our states tried to leave the enforcement of state traffic laws to village constables and county sheriffs, but soon had to create corps of state troopers for the purpose.

Two things particularly should be noted just here. As pacifists urge that police powers be used curatively to restrain, upon individuals rather than on collective groups,[1] we are not proposing something new and untried, even on the international level. Nor are we alone in our insistence upon the use of such methods. The principle is most explicitly set forth and upheld by Streit in his *Union Now* for law enforcement within his projected federal union of democracies.[2] In that context, Streit cites powerful argumentative support from Alexander Hamilton's *Federalist* papers. Other groups of world federalists and other books on world federation are similarly precise in insisting that police must operate constructively upon individual persons rather than destructively upon collective units.[3]

This utterly essential element was written into our fundamental law by our American founding fathers, and the precedent has been followed with beneficial results by every other federal system throughout the earth. A full and clear outline of the origin and working of such systems is supplied in the great pamphlet, *Coercion of States: in Federal Unions.*[4] As we stand for true international law and for genuine police methods in its enforcement, our arguments are bulwarked by the decades of successful experience in the wholesome use of such means by the U.S.A., Canada, Switzerland, Venezuela, Australia, Argentina, South Africa, and others.

Perhaps the most common objection to suggested analogies with existing federal unions is the assertion that these units are in each case individual countries, having the cohesive binder of patriotic unity. Consequently, force seldom needs to be used; the problem is brought down to comprehensible proportions. But these federal systems had to get under way against divisions, jealousies, and bitterness, comparable to those that curse our world now. Their present national unities are to a large degree the *product* of their unions. In the same way, a sense of common world citizenship would develop swiftly in a united world; coercive powers could then become more and more implicit as they so largely are now within our present nations.

The federal method of maintaining order had to validate itself in each instance in the early periods of each nation before a spirit of national unity had become powerful. During these eras, federal unions were essentially *international* governments. They still are in a very real sense. Even today, all of the federal systems continue to have the same basic problems that will confront any future Commonwealth of Man. They administer under law the common concerns of large, widely separated territories upon which live varied races speaking two or more languages. Unity within diversity without war, such as the world desperately seeks, already exists all over the globe to an astounding degree. We tend to overlook the colossal significance of a Switzerland, a Soviet Union, or our own melting pot of the earth's races.

Abuses Inevitable

In happily acclaiming the achievement of federalism, one does not thereby approve everything within it. The powers of government are widely used throughout the U.S.A. to perpetuate injustice and wrong, especially in machine-ridden Northern cities and in the near-fascism of most Southern states. Conditions in the Union of South Africa are far worse. But, within all governed areas, recourse to violence has become exceptional; forward-looking citizens are able to work for a bettering of conditions by peaceable means, as they could not possibly do if such areas were divided like Europe into separate warring states. The world must be governed. With war—apogee of all evils put together—eliminated, we can labor within nonviolent regimes toward a perfecting of human relationships.

It is perhaps necessary to labor this point: one does not condone nor approve abuses of power by our police just because one favors application of the same *type* of policing to world conditions. I cannot imagine that we could maintain a manner of life either civilized or decent, if entirely without police. Just so I am convinced that a world government must possess legitimate power to enforce law. I will denounce and work against any abuses of this power by a world authority, just as I exercise such citizenship rights in four other geographical divisions: Greenwich, Fairfield County, Connecticut, U.S.A. But I cannot say that we must have no police in world politics simply because such powers are subject to misuse, any more than I am able to do so at other levels of human association.

"The peace which passeth understanding" comes only from communion of spirit with Spirit. Life through days like these is endurable only by reason of that inner citadel which the world did not build and cannot tear down. In contrast, peace in its primary denotation, as the word is ordinarily used, is something corporate and objective; it is primarily a by-product of just government. Political peace is a regime within which at least tolerable measures of justice, security, and opportunity are available to all under lawful and orderly processes.

But even if the numbers willing to behave themselves without any compulsion exceeded 99 per cent, restraining coercions would still be required for the remaining fraction of 1 per cent. Consequently I am a CO only to the use of violence, not to the use of force. I shall do all I can to oppose "unwarranted and unlawful use of force," i.e. violence, and I shall welcome in world affairs as I do elsewhere the control and direction of physical coercion by agencies as disinterested as we are able to make them, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

---

[1] See the excellent letters by Stella M. Robbins and Henry W. Pinkham in *Fellowship*, March, 1943.

[2] See p. 144 of original edition, Harpers, 1939.

[3] See Adler's *How to Think About War and Peace*, Simon & Schuster, p. 144, item 6.

[4] Freeman and Paullin, The Pacifist Research Bureau, Philadelphia.

World Unity Must Precede World Police

—and because world government is not in sight, current international police plans would lead to collective war; we must develop world unity first

Says THEODORE PAULLIN*

IN his radio address of April 9, 1944, Secretary Hull spoke of a projected "international organization to maintain peace and prevent aggression." "It must," he said, "provide for the maintenance of adequate forces to preserve peace and it must provide the institutions and procedures for calling this force into action to preserve peace."

The United States once fought a war to *end* war. Now, in the midst of an even more devastating conflict which proves how vain that former effort was, our government apparently is preparing us for participation in some future war to *prevent* war.

To all true lovers of peace, the prospect is most alarming. But opinion polls assure us that the people share the belief of our leaders that war and "aggression" can be prevented by force of arms. Perhaps it is inevitable that they should think so now, absorbed as they are in an all-embracing military conflict, in which they have staked the future of their country and of the world upon the arbitrament of the sword. To admit now that there is any way other than the use of naked force to resolve conflict would be to admit, half-way at least, that our present exclusive emphasis on "victory" is mistaken and that the sacrifices made in its name have been made in vain. For the sake of sanity itself the fiction must be maintained that the successful use of military force can and will usher in a new world order, and that continued reliance upon overwhelming military might can maintain "peace" and make possible the good life that men so passionately desire.

But since most men in our society normally condemn the use of violence unregulated by law, they are unable to admit to themselves that they have unconsciously adopted the philosophy of force which they attribute to their present enemies. Instead, when they talk about its future use, they prefer to hide behind a euphemism like the term "international police force." But even while they talk of policing aggressors and setting up international organizations to enforce peace, preparations are made to retain for the United States alone the bases seized from Japan in the Pacific, to continue the construction of a navy that can rule the seven seas, and to institute permanent military conscription so that the United States will be prepared sooner to participate in the next world war!

Obviously, most advocates of force are not really talking about international *police*. Police are the agents of well-established governments acting in true communities against an insignificant number of people who for one reason or another have not accepted the code of conduct which the vast majority follow, *and would follow even though there were no threat of physical enforcement.*

Our domestic police forces would be unable to enforce any law that did not have the support of an overwhelming public opinion. In 1932 the police could not restrain Iowa farmers who used violence to prevent judges from legally foreclosing farm mortgages. The complete failure of the attempts to enforce the prohibition amendment also should give us ample proof of the fact that police measures cannot succeed in imposing a law which is rejected by any large minority of the population.

Some of the advocates of an international police force see clearly the distinction between an international army designed for use against whole nations and a true police force operating only upon individuals within a well-established system of law under which the accused, even after his arrest, must be found guilty by a court before any punishment may be administered.

Such advocates support the establishment of a true international government on the model of the federal government of the United States. Our federal government has its own police officers who act directly upon individuals who disobey federal laws. The federal police officers cross state lines in pursuit of criminals without necessarily consulting local authorities. Why could not the police forces of a world government act in the same way, as true police, in apprehending individuals who committed acts defined as criminal by world law because they were disturbing to the general peace of the world?

World Federation Not In Sight

Indeed they might—if a world government were established. But in the state of the world today, with differences and jealousies even among the nations that supposedly are united in carrying on war against a common enemy, with each nation pursuing its own particular interests, it is unthinkable that any important nation at any forseeable date will surrender to a world government the significant powers that would be necessary to make such a government effective. We may begin to think otherwise when the American people through their elected representatives agree to turn over control of the American tariff to some international body. World government may be a desirable goal, but its establishment after the present war is beyond the realm of conceivable possibility.

Since the type of true international police which the advocates of world government propose is at present outside the realm of practical politics, these well-intentioned people, in placing emphasis upon their advocacy of an "international police force," are actually playing into the hands of those who use this term to apply to some international system of power politics. In the minds of the public the distinction between an international police force and an international army is so vague that the two are usually identified with one another. It is unfortunate that so many pacifists who really are advocating the creation of a world society with a world government should emphasize an aspect of their proposal which can so easily be misunderstood. In effect, their influence supports the promoters of narrow nationalism, American imperialism, the balance-of-

* Assistant director of the Pacifist Research Bureau; author of *Comparative Peace Plans;* co-author of *Coercion of States: in Federal Unions.*

power system, or a system of permanent alliances based upon the present unity in war—all of which these very pacifists abhor.

Until the time comes for the establishment of a world government, based on the consent of the governed as ultimately all governments must be, pacifists ought to support those less-than-ideal measures which move in the direction of creating the sense of world community upon which some day such government may be built; and they ought to oppose wholeheartedly any proposal to include in the post-war settlement any provision for the use of force on an international scale.

Force Against States Fails

All our experience shows us that the use of force against nations or states is impractical as a method of preventing war. The League of Nations was founded upon the notion that sanctions, military or other, could effectively prevent aggression. In the reaction against the military system which swept over this country after the last war, the United States rejected membership in the League because Americans did not want to be obligated to intervene in every international quarrel that might break out anywhere in the world. But even those nations that did join the League actually refused to use the sanctions provided for in the Covenant, largely because the decision to use them had to be made by the representatives of nations that still followed the idea of national interest rather than some abstract principle of general justice. Although the Assembly of the League declared that Japan had broken the Covenant in 1931, no sanctions were applied because the important nations of Europe did not care to condemn the system of imperialism in which they themselves were so deeply involved. When sanctions were applied to Italy in 1935, the gesture was half-hearted because Britain and France still hoped to retain the friendship of Italy in a possible struggle against Germany. Thus immediate political considerations prevented the application of the principles which the League was supposed to represent. Is there any reason to suppose that a new international organization would be free from similar political pitfalls?

On the other hand, very effective international action and organization are possible without the inclusion of sanctions, either economic or military. The Inter-American System and the British Commonwealth of Nations show us how strong international ties may become even when there is no threat of force to maintain unity. These international unions are held together by sentiment. If the sentiment for world unity were as strong, we might also have a world organization which would be as closely knit.

Unity Must Come First

The most important task of peace lovers in the world today is to foster the growth of such a popular desire for unity, rather than to advocate the use of police forces under a system of world government which is beyond the realm of immediate practical possibility. Pacifists in particular ought not to support such a police proposal now, for the following reasons:

1. In the present atmosphere of world opinion a true world *police* force cannot be established. Popular support for the idea is predicated on the assumption that Germany and Japan will be the only "aggressors" in the future, and that the present United Nations, or the Big Four, or an Anglo-American combination must "police" the world. To support any proposal for the use of international force under present circumstances only helps to intensify this notion, and make it more likely that the Axis nations will be excluded from those international organizations which might encourage the development of a true world society.

2. The use of an international army is itself war. Law-breaking individuals do not cause aggressive war. Before a Hitler can rise to power, there must be widespread discontent among great masses of people as the result of some real grievance or injustice. What is called "aggression" is only an attempt to change the *status quo* by military force. If counter force were to be used against such "aggression," it would be used only against a large and united group. Such action would be indistinguishable from the older type of war. The American Civil War proves that even under a well-established government, warfare, with all its suffering and destruction, can break out when a large group of people feel that they have a sufficient grievance.

3. Agitation for an international police force diverts popular attention from the real issues of our day by persuading people that the maintenance of preponderant military power will make it unnecessary to change the *status quo ante bellum*. Thus those who derived benefits from the pre-war system can ignore such problems as imperialism, world-wide racial discrimination, and nationalistic tariff barriers. If the political leaders of the United Nations should succeed in establishing something called an "international police," the peoples of the world might well have a false sense of security from war which would lead them to continue ignoring the necessity of eliminating the real causes of war, as the existence of the League of Nations with its emphasis on "collective security" did after the First World War.

Pacifists more than others should recognize the *negative* character of all force. At best it can only restrain; it can never by itself create the new world society which we desire.

We should break with the negativistic and defeatist attitude which dominates the world today. We should expend our energies in attempting to establish *positive* agencies for the elimination of the causes of international conflict. Rather than supporting proposals for an international organization to exercise military power, we should work unremittingly for the creation of agencies to bring about peaceful change, to give expression to the moral principles of mankind through judicial decisions on international disputes, and to carry on the day-by-day tasks of administration in many matters of international concern. In such agencies the peoples of the world would learn through practical experience the advantages of true cooperation. At the same time we should carry on the greatest educational campaign of which we are capable to promote understanding and tolerance among all peoples. Only when men's ideas and loyalties embrace the whole world will the world society be born.

When a world society becomes a reality, that will be time to consider the establishment of world government. We can then intelligently discuss the desirability of giving that world government police powers under the limitations of law. Until that time such discussion can only serve to confuse the real issues that confront us.

Russia in World Affairs

By A. J. MUSTE

IN the June issue of *Fellowship* we dealt with the Communist philosophy of life as a profound menace to the Jewish-Christian and democratic faith and way of life. We announced that we would attempt in the present issue to analyze some of the military and especially political developments centering in Russia. The factors in the problem before us may be defined in the following terms: (1) Russia is a great historic state which for centuries, whenever opportunity has offered, has pursued a policy of expansion. (2) It will emerge from the present war a more powerful state, both absolutely and in relation to other states, than it has ever been before. (3) It has evolved, through a combination of the Russian state power, the nationalism of the Russian people, and a revision of Communist revolutionary strategy and tactics, a far more efficient instrument for expansion than it has ever had before or than any other modern power possesses. (4) The situation in the closing period of the war and in the post-war period is and will be such that the attempt to use this instrument on a large scale will almost certainly be made—can in a sense hardly be avoided.

How the state, with its capital now at Moscow and again at Leningrad, has spread over what we call Russia in Europe and Russia in Asia, one-sixth of the land surface of the globe, is now a familiar story. For our present purpose it will suffice to recall three items in that history. For one thing, Russia played much the same role in saving Europe from Napoleon that it is now playing in stopping Hitler. The epic struggle against Napoleon is usually thought of as a moving example of a people standing on its own soil to defend "hearth and home" against the invader. It is not so generally known that, as soon as Napoleon executed his ill-fated retreat, Russian armies pushed into the heart of Europe nearly to the banks of the Oder and the Danube. For a time it looked as though war would break out between Russia and a huge European coalition headed by Great Britain bent on restoring the balance of power.

Secondly, during the nineteenth century a deep-seated antagonism developed. The Russian Bear pushing toward "warm-water" ports on the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, through Persia to the Persian Gulf, through Afghanistan toward India, through Siberia to the Pacific, was the feared antagonist of the British Empire.

In his indispensable analysis of Russian foreign policy, *Russia and Post-War Europe,* D. J. Dallin sets forth a third historical factor which is essential as background for understanding Russia's probable course in this war. At the beginning of World War I, Russian aspirations for western expansion revived. The secret treaties published by the Bolsheviks revealed the program for this expansion, which will not prevent the successors of those Bolsheviks from trying to carry out the same program. All the Polish territories were to be brought into the Russian Empire. East Prussia was to be annexed. Eastern Galicia was to be transferred from Austria to Russia. A Czech Kingdom was to be created under a Russian protectorate. (Since under Benés' policy the Czech Republic is to be under a virtual Russian protectorate, it is interesting to note that at the beginning of the last war his great predecessor, Thomas Masaryk said "the general wish of the Czechs is to have a Russian king.") A strip of land between Austria and Hungary was to become a corridor from the Czechs to the Serbians. Hungary was to be in part incorporated into Russia, in part brought into "the Russian sphere." Turkey was to be ousted from Europe, Russia to receive the major portion of her European possessions including Constantinople. In the early years of World War I Lloyd George yielded to these demands!

It is not necessary to dwell on Russia's vast human and material resources. The President of the United States himself proclaims through a mouthpiece in the *Saturday Evening Post* that Russia must at all costs be appeased. Assistant Secretary of State Berle not long ago pointed out that by 1970 the population of the United States would probably be stabilized at 135 million; Great Britain will have dropped to 42, Germany to 64, France to 37. Meanwhile Russia will have risen from 175 to 222 million! These millions have learned to use modern technology to develop their colossal resources. It may be that Russia will have been extended by the war to such a point that a brief period for recuperation will be necessary; but this will not last.

The most important and the least understood factor in Russian development is the revision in Communist revolutionary strategy and tactics which the Russians have now perfected and fused with the intense nationalistic spirit of the Russian people into the most efficient instrument for expansion which exists in the world today. Pro-war liberals in this country, and of course the Communists and fellow-travelers, base their propaganda that the United States and other capitalist countries no longer "have anything to fear" from Russia on the assertion that Stalin has abandoned the idea of world-revolution. Consequently conservatives and others who are not prepared to trust Russia and collaborate in war or peace can only be conscious tools or unconscious dupes of the Nazis.

There is this much basis for such assertions, viz., that the original idea of the Bolsheviks to promote and aid proletarian or popular revolutions in other countries has been abandoned. Stalin and his colleagues are now at the head of a great nation. They have a vested interest, psychological and otherwise if not monetary, in the perpetuation of the present regime. They constitute a dictatorship and dictatorships are least interested in and often most afraid of revolution.

But that does not mean that the old ambition of getting rid of capitalist regimes and taking their people into the Soviet fold has been given up. Says Dallin: "The major program for Soviet policy sets forth, officially and unalterably, the goal of extending the Union to include other nations." Russia is now regarded as the homeland, center and magnet of communism; and since communism and the Soviet state are now thought of as one, communism, in its Stalinist form, is now to be spread not by propaganda and certainly not by popular revolts, but by the power of the Soviet state and its armed forces. This does not mean necessarily by outright military aggression. Indeed, so far

as possible this is to be avoided and the goal "as officially proclaimed, is expansion without aggression, i.e. expansion through voluntary adhesion." Conditions are to be created whereby it becomes impossible for a nation to exist except in the Russian sphere of influence or by outright incorporation into the Soviet Union. When necessary, however, military force will be used as against Finland, the Baltic countries, and Poland.

The Communist parties, ostensibly no longer "Russian," no longer units in a revolutionary international, the Comintern, now take on a "national" character in every country. As such, they insist on a place in the national or coalition cabinets in countries like Italy. Thus they are in a position to work inside the government, to put their men into key positions, to cooperate with the Russian secret police and probably help organize a division of it in their own native land, and so to prepare to take power when the moment seems opportune. Often there is little attempt to cloak these operations with secrecy. Togliatti, party name Ercole, for example, quite ostentatiously flies from Moscow to Italy, takes his place in the coalition cabinet with such men as Sforza and Croce, and announces that Communists want no communism but only democracy in Italy! Nowhere is there the slightest sign that there is less conformity than before to "the Moscow line."

Indeed the "dissolution" of the Comintern and the Communist parties means exactly the opposite. The revolution is now to be achieved by the foreign policy of a great power-state and that policy is to be implemented by war. But in war there is no place for independent action, for party discussions even of the old type. In war all must be entrusted to the military leaders, the Leader. "Obedience, even to sometimes incomprehensible directives" becomes the chief duty of all good Communists. Moreover, "if strategy is the business of the Commander-in-Chief, congresses are useless." Hence no more congresses, no more Comintern, no more Communist parties!

Another instrument for the new strategy is to be found in the guerrilla troops like Tito's Partisans in Yugoslavia. Characterized by "complete secrecy, mutual responsibility, centralized leadership, methods of armed fighting and strict discipline," these troops fight the Germans today and can engage in revolutionary civil war or support Russian liberating (invading) armies tomorrow.

In the meantime Russia itself is becoming increasingly militarized and the post-war program is one of intensive militarization. The *New York Times* on May 12 of this year carried a revealing AP dispatch from Kalinin, Russia. Kalinin presents "a scene of smart young men with military bearing and elegant manners. . . . The Suvorov military school . . .opened December 1 with 510 pupils. . . . The selection committee gave preference to the sons of generals, USSR officers, Partisans. . . . These boys are aged 8 to 13 with snappy black uniforms and shaven heads. Already they are marching, saluting and bowing like miniature officers."

The forces we have described will push their way inevitably and as rapidly as conditions permit westward into Europe, including Germany (the eastern part of which is by agreement with Great Britain and the United States to be "policed" by Russia), into the Balkans, toward the Mediterranean. What will there be to stop them? How can they permit other forces to take control?

Will this mean that these lands are brought into the Soviet or Communist economic order as well as political hegemony? Not necessarily and not immediately. Certainly Stalin will not be in a hurry about this. He is not finicky. Like Mr. Churchill, he is willing to get along with the devotees of any system, even racism, if they don't attack him. But Dr. Dallin has summed up in a sentence the almost certain eventual outcome: "The preservation in those countries of the basic forms of the old economic system, deprived of extensive foreign credits and accompanied by the inevitable flight of capital and widespread unemployment would probably provide a stimulus for scattered and gradual (assimilation) with the norms of the Soviet Union."

The great power most immediately threatened by these developments will be Great Britain: no power to offset Russia on the continent, the Mediterranean life-line threatened, and all the rest. Time and again over the idea of European federations, over Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, the conflict has come into the open.

It is well to keep in mind in this connection the background of conflict between Russia and Britain, to which we have already alluded. Stalin wrote some years ago: "English capitalism always was, is and will be the most vicious strangler of popular revolution. . . . The Soviet people will never forget the violations, robberies and military invasion which were inflicted on our country a few years ago by the grace of English capitalists." And again he declared that there are "two principal but polar centers of attraction . . . in the world: the Anglo-American center for the bourgeois governments and the Soviet Union for the workers of the west and the revolutionary east."

Churchill for his part has spoken of "the dark power of Moscow" where we have a band of cosmopolitan conspirators gathered from the underworlds of the great cities of Europe and America." And as recently as 1932 he warned that "we must remember that the great mass of Russia, with its enormous armies and with its schools of ardent students of chemical warfare, its poison gas, its tanks and all its appliances, looms up all along the Eastern frontier of Europe."

How will Mr. Churchill or his successor, with American aid as usual, seek to meet this threat to the Empire at whose liquidation he does not choose to preside? By occupying Germany for an indefinite period? By restoring Germany to power as Britain did after World War I and threatening Russia with an Anglo-German alliance? By building a west wall including Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, the Low Countries, and Scandinavia?

Churchill's and Roosevelt's and Stalin's main reliance is on an "understanding" whereby the Big Three will organize and "police" the post-war world—bare-faced power politics. Certainly there is nothing here on which to build durable peace. Out of this, militarization, dictatorship, terror and more war will come, unless the world sharply reverses its course. We are helping to build up a force much greater than Hitler ever commanded for a regime which has proved that it can be as ruthless and probably more determined and cold-blooded than the Nazis. For this, on a hundred battlefields the sons of all the nations now perish.

It is time for a people's Declaration of Independence from all war-makers and all totalitarians.

News from the Peace Front

Four More FOR Secretaries Refuse Conscription

Two members of the national FOR staff began serving prison terms during the past month, and two others are still awaiting developments after refusing to accept CPS assignments or in any other way to cooperate with the government's conscription processes.

R. Alfred Hassler, managing editor of FELLOWSHIP and co-secretary of the Literature Department at the New York headquarters, was given a three-year sentence on June 5 and began serving his time June 12. He had refused to report to CPS camp on May 2. For some time there appeared to be a possibility that his draft board would reclassify him 2A because of the nature of his work and the fact that he is 34 years old—beyond the upper limit recently set by the army for the men it wants in military service. But because these new rulings did not go into effect until a few days after Hassler was "knowingly delinquent" the board would not reclassify him. He was still being held at Federal Detention Headquarters in New York as this issue of *Fellowship* went to press.

Hassler has made an enviable record in the little more than two years that he has served on the staff. Besides increasing literature production several times over, he has written three booklets, *Conscripts of Conscience, Pattern for Peacemakers,* and *The Next Peace,* and several articles in FELLOWSHIP. His place on the staff will be held open for him, pending his release from prison, but in the meantime his responsibilities will be taken over by J. Elliott Finlay, who became co-secretary of the Literature Department last March. Mrs. Hassler is employed in New York City.

Axford Also Imprisoned

Roger Axford, until recently serving as FOR Midwest Secretary in Chicago, also was sentenced to three years in prison and has begun serving his term. He is a licensed Methodist minister, and had served as pastor of several churches before taking up the FOR work in Chicago. He notified his draft board that he still considered himself a minister, but did not insist on special treatment because he believed all Christian CO's should have the same privilege of exemption, whether ministers or not. Axford was enrolled as a student in Chicago Theological Seminary on Dec. 27, 1943, and President Palmer requested his draft board to grant him a 4D classification on that ground, but the request was refused. Axford is unmarried.

Other Cases Pending

In the meantime two other cases are still undecided. Glenn Smiley, FOR's Southwest Secretary, in Los Angeles, is facing trial on July 10 for refusing to report for his physical examination. He is an ordained Methodist minister but has waived exemption on that ground. He is fairly sure that he could not pass the physical exam, but he is refusing to report because he considers this the one point at which he can make an effective testimony against the conscription system. He is married and has three children.

Caleb Foote, Northern California Secretary, in Berkeley, California, more than a year ago refused cooperation with the conscription system and was imprisoned for six months. Upon his release he was ordered by his draft board to report for a pre-induction physical exam, and he refused. He is still free and carrying on his work as usual, but is expecting to be arrested and sentenced again almost any day. He is married but has no children. Foote is well known as the author of *Outcasts,* the booklet published by the FOR last fall giving the facts about Japanese relocation.

National Council Voting on NSBRO

At the meeting of the National Council of the FOR, held in New York on May 29 and 30, the matter of FOR participation in the National Service Board for Religious Objectors again came up for discussion. After debate lasting nearly a whole day, a vote on the question revealed 14 in favor of withdrawal and 10 opposed; but those present decided that the entire membership of the Council ought to be polled. Therefore it was agreed that ballots would be sent to all Council members and that the result of this total vote should be determinative. The final date for reception of ballots is July 12.

A retreat for staff members and members of the National Council was held on three successive days immediately preceding the Council meeting. These sessions provided opportunity for extended discussion of many phases of the world situation and of the FOR program for the coming months.

Salvador Stages Non-Violent Revolt

A remarkable demonstration of non-violent resistance by almost the whole population of a nation against the armed oppression of a dictator was staged recently in El Salvador, Central America.

Hernandez Martinez, dictator "president" of El Salvador for thirteen years, had built up a regime so oppressive that a popular uprising was inevitable. It came early in April, in the form of a military rebellion. But the swift and ruthless action of the dictator's forces resulted in almost immediate defeat of the revolt. The leaders were executed, imprisoned, or forced to flee. A professor, beloved by his students, was seized as the instigator of the revolt.

Then high school and college students carried on the revolt in a new form. They issued a call for a general strike and a widespread program of passive resistance and non-cooperation with the government. The citizens responded heartily, and the strike rapidly gathered momentum. By the first week of May practically all business in San Salvador, the capital city, was paralyzed. Government papers were the only ones published, and they were left unbought. Transportation ceased. Movies were unpatronized. Offices and factories were closed.

Exactly two weeks after the strike had begun, President Martinez talked things over with his cabinet and decided to resign. He fled for safety to Guatemala, leaving the government in the hands of a provisional president, Senor Menendez. If the success of this people's revolution should inspire popular leaders in other Latin American dictatorships, the political complexion of a dozen nations might change almost overnight.

Mrs. Roosevelt Corrected

In the June *Ladies Home Journal* Mrs. Roosevelt betrayed woeful ignorance about conscientious objectors. In answer to a reader's question the First Lady declared that dependents of COs receive no allotments because the CO is not in the army, is not performing any service for the country, and that any work he does in a CPS camp is "work which he chooses to do and is not work which the Government is asking him to do as a citizen."

Does not Mrs. Roosevelt know that by act of Congress COs are required to perform work of national importance under civilian direction, and that if their work is of no service to the country then the Government is to blame? In her answer she avoided entirely any recognition of the injustice that is involved in leaving dependents of conscripted COs without any source of support.

The News in Brief

Educational Groups Oppose Conscription

In a statement against the present adoption of universal military service the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the Problems and Plans Committee of the American Council on Education gave the following reasons to support their opposition to such a measure:

1. Selective service is now meeting all needs of the army and should be able to continue to do so following the cessation of hostilities.

2. Longtime military necessity does not justify it.

3. Policing the peace *may* require a large standing army, but to commit ourselves to such a policy now would be dangerous.

4. The opinions of those now fighting should have a share in the decision, which therefore should be delayed until the war is over.

5. The nature of the peace desired by the American people should promote international cooperation and reduce the necessity of large-scale post-war military establishments.

COs Become Citizens

Two non-combatant COs serving as 1AOs in the Medical Corps, recently were admitted to citizenship in spite of the Supreme Court ruling denying that privilege to alien conscientious objectors. The action resulted from the decision of Federal Judge Leavy of the District Court in Tacoma, Wash. He said that the Selective Service Act would be meaningless if under it COs performing military duty in army uniform were to be denied privileges of citizenship. This may be a step towards eventual granting of citizenship to all alien pacifists.

Parole Plan Not Popular at Sandstone

Of the 550 inmates of the federal prison at Sandstone, Minnesota, 301 are COs, and only 25 of them are interested in parole under the recent Executive Order 8641. About half of them would accept no parole because of the unusually stringent restrictions on CO paroles; the other half would accept regular parole when they become eligible for it, but most CO applications for regular parole are turned down. If the Government really wants to clear the prisons of COs it will have to offer much more reasonable terms and then figure out some way of getting parole boards to grant the paroles when COs apply for them.

The U. S. Supreme Court recently refused to review the Lynn case, which involved a charge of discrimination against Negroes in the selection and training of men for the Army. This was an entirely unexpected action because the lower court had turned in a two-to-one decision with Justice Charles E. Clark dissenting in favor of Lynn. The Supreme Court's refusal was said to be "on the ground that the case is moot, it appearing that the petitioner is no longer in the respondent's custody." (Lynn was sent overseas several months ago.) But the obvious reason for the court's action was the desire to avoid so controversial an issue. Wilfred H. Kerr, co-chairman of the Lynn Committee declared that the committee will carry on the fight and will file a petition for a rehearing immediately. The Supreme Court adjourns for the summer and the case will not be finally decided until fall in any event.

* * *

The Canadian Government has issued a non-interest bearing relief bond for pacifists. About three million dollars worth already have been purchased. The funds thus raised have been applied to Canada's contribution to UNRRA.

* * *

Krishnalal Shridharani, well known Indian author of *War Without Violence,* was recently classified 1A by his draft board. He has appealed the case on the grounds that he should be classified 4E.

* * *

The General Conference of the Methodist Church, held recently in Kansas City, passed a recommendation that no future general conference shall ever meet in any city where racial segregation prevents adequate entertainment of all the delegates.

* * *

William Penn College, at Oskaloosa, Iowa, under the leadership of President Cecil E. Hinshaw, is endeavoring to create a faculty devoted to the ideals of Quakerism. At present they are looking for instructors in music, biology, and physical education.

* * *

In a letter to the *New York Times,* answering a charge that Mahatma Gandhi invited the Japanese invasion by proclaiming non-resistance toward them, J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, said that of course Gandhi does believe in soul-force and in non-resistance, but that this cannot be construed as inviting invasion. He pointed out that the facts of the matter were distorted by quoting some of Gandhi's statements and omitting others. When asked what India would do in case of attack by the Japanese, Gandhi said: "There should be no compromise, no trade, no barter and acquiescence and no cooperation with the invader." That is not exactly an invitation to the Japanese to come in and take over.

* * *

A training course for ministers on the achievement of racial justice through non-violent direct action, open to both Negroes and whites, is offered by the Harlem Ashram, 2013 Fifth Avenue, New York 35, from August 14 to 26.

* * *

Lew Ayres, former film star, now in non-combatant service in the Army, recently expressed the intention of becoming a Congregational minister after the war. He is now a chaplain's aide.

* * *

At least 100 young refugees who had been sheltered in the FOR Children's Home at Le Chambon in France, have been saved from deportation and death in recent months by the heroic work of various individuals who risked their lives to get the children to neutral territory.

* * *

The War Resisters International, meeting in London on May Day, 1944, sent "greetings to comrades throughout the world. It pays homage to those who have already suffered for their faith and affirms its belief that only by the solidarity of those in every land who resist the monster of war, can war be outlawed." Nevin Sayre had sent to the meeting a greeting from the American FOR.

* * *

A cooperative music festival in Jerusalem recently brought together more than 600 Jewish, Moslem, and Christian children to sing songs of all three faiths under the direction of Rolla Foley, of the Quaker school at Ram Allah. (Worldover Press)

* * *

Several CPS men, some of them married, are badly needing a vacation from their intensive schedules in hospitals or other institutions, but have no financial resources. Any members who have (or know of) a summer cottage that could be made available to such persons for a part of the summer are asked to notify the FOR headquarters.

Help Wanted

The FOR office in New York will need three young women workers very soon—two with stenographic and secretarial abilities, and one with a taste for work requiring meticulous attention to details. Write us if interested.

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

After Victory

From Victory to Peace. By Paul Hutchinson, Willett, Clark & Co., Chicago, 1943. 226 pp. $1.50.

The difference between the war-and-peace attitude of the churches in this war and in the First World War could not be more strikingly shown than by a comparison of this book and of *Preacher's Present Arms,* the book by Ray Abrams which gives the record of what leading ecclesiastics said in the earlier conflict. The comparison is not altogether fair because the latter volume was written *after* the war and was devoted almost entirely to showing up the pro-war crusading belligerency of the churches, whereas Mr. Hutchinson's description and challenge is written while the war is still on and by a man who stands much closer to the churches and has more faith in them. But even when a liberal allowance has been made for such differences it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the record of the churches this time has so far been very much better; and for this the pacifists may well thank God and be encouraged.

However, there is a new and decisive factor in the present situation which postpones into the post-war period the verdict that history will write upon the churches' stewardship of religion in World War II. The difference is that this time the churches while largely tolerating the war and its superiniquities such as food blockade, wholesale bombing of cities, and the government's ruthless "unconditional surrender" policy, have put their emphasis upon winning a just and durable post-war peace. As Mr. Hutchinson shows, they have gone in for study conferences and between 1940 and the winter of 1943 they issued a number of notable declarations setting forth moral principles and criteria on which the peace must be constructed.

Now comes the testing time of these pronouncements. Having given consent by silence to the war process to the extent which they have, will the churches be able to shake themselves loose on the day of the foe's surrender and come forth as unbound prophets of the Lord to mobilize their laymen and the war stricken masses of the world to build Jerusalem — not in England's green and pleasant land, alas, but in the bitter poverty and desolation which war has wrought upon our planet?

This is the stark challenge that motivates Dr. Hutchinson's book. What will the churches do "when Johnny comes marching home again"? "The prophetic voice of the church must be sounded abroad very soon—or the hour of opportunity will pass forever."

This book better than any other holds up to the churches the mirror of what they have said about the peace to which they have committed themselves after this war. Its chapters are admirable on "The Search for a World Community"; "Power Politics and the World Community"; "What of the Empires?"; "The Race Demon"; "Who Shall Be Armed?"; "On the Treatment of Enemies"; and "Hunger Means War." An appendix of 35 pages gives the complete text of the most important British and American post-war peace pronouncements.

The book should be read, pondered, and acted upon by all Christians who want the church to meet its responsibilities in the day of judgment that is in some respects already here.

J. N. S.

Peace Pamphlets

War, Transition and Peace, published by the Fellowship of Reconciliation and other peace groups, 1944. 32 pages. 15¢

Coercion of States in International Organizations, by Harrop A. Freeman. Pacifist Research Bureau, 1944. 25¢

Coercion of States: in Federal Unions, by Harrop Freeman and Theodore Paullin. Pacifist Research Bureau, 1943. 25¢

The above pamphlets do much to refute the charge that pacifists are politically irresponsible. Emanating from pacifist sources, they avoid the pitfalls of propagandist generalization and come to grips with the job of informing contemporary non-pacifist opinion on immediate choices confronting the nations that will tend toward another war or durable peace. Members of the FOR should read all three pamphlets this summer and get at least one non-pacifist friend to read one or more of them before the debate on the election for President gets under way. Mary Wooley once said, *"We have to win peace by conversation,"* and there is a lot to that, although of course it is far from a complete prescription.

War, Transition and Peace is sponsored by 23 leaders of the American pacifist movement and published jointly by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the National Council for the Prevention of War, the Peace Section of the American Friends Service Committee, the War Resisters League, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. It is the outstanding consensus of recommendations from this wing of the American peace movement to our fellow citizens regarding the vital turns on the road to peace that will confront us in the very near future.

The argument is not based on pacifist presuppositions, but after a dip into underlying causes of the First and Second World Wars it discusses in Part II the "Essentials of Peace"—spiritual, political, economic—and the critical change-over from present war to the period succeeding hostilities.

Part III deals with the central problems of "World Organization." The advantages and disadvantages of "World Government" versus the "Functional Approach" to world community are clearly analyzed with eyes open to the present obstacles of nationalism, imperialism, economic and armament interests, and lack of popular education, which lie in the path, as well as the resources for constructive achievement that might conceivably be brought into play.

In conclusion the pamphlet cautions pacifists against despairing and taking "too narrow a view of the nature of the changing world."

Coercion of States in International Organizations, by Harrop Freeman, of the Law Department of William and Mary College, is a lawyer's careful examination in condensed and popular form of "plans for the use by a central organization of coercion by arms against a member state, the acceptance or rejection of those plans, the interpretations of and the effects of the use of coercion, and some of the non-coercive aspects of each organization for the purpose of comparison." Within these self-appointed limits the author does a first class job. Although he starts with the period of 1600, the bulk of the pamphlet is devoted to the League of Nations, the Pan American Union, and the British Commonwealth of Nations. The pages dealing with the League's rejection by the United States and its experience with sanctions are especially informative. Disclaiming "categorical conclusions," the author ends up with a series of "tentative hypotheses" which hold that political unity develops from a sense of community built up by intangible forces, that the most effective international organizations have been consultative bodies wherein problems could be solved rather than aggression punished, and that "if the world is now 'one world' there is no longer room for plans based upon an international army."

Coercion of States: in Federal Unions, the valuable companion pamphlet by the same author and Theodore Paullin, published in January 1943, and dealing with proposals to employ force upon member states by federal unions, outlines the history of such proposals and their rejection by the United States, Switzerland, the Union of South Africa, Canada, and Australia. The less clear cases of Germany, Brazil and certain other federations are touched upon. The experience of history, the authors conclude, is that within federal unions coercion is a disruptive and not a cohesive influence.

J. N. S.

Pro and Con

Conscription

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Universal compulsory military training or conscription has lasted on the continent of Europe for over one hundred years, and it has been called, with some justice, the key to modern European history. After trial of more than a century, it must be evident that instead of leading to peace and cooperation among the nations, it has been the active basis of their war system and of the wars of Europe. The conclusion which practically all students of European history and of social and political institutions have reached is that the universal training of large populations to the use of arms has invariably been followed in history by increased resort to armed force, both within nations and between nations. The United States could scarcely look for any different result if we follow the example of Europe in this matter.

Those in this country who fear a proletarian revolution, a civil war between classes, should bear in mind that the revolutionary tribunals of Russia were Workmen and *Soldiers* Councils. If it had not been for the soldiers in these councils, they would have been, I believe, comparatively harmless, at least incapable of initiating and carrying through successfully a proletarian revolution. But when the whole population has been trained to the use of armed force, they naturally resort to armed force as a political method. Therefore, if there is one thing more certain than another to bring to pass in this country such an event as the Russian revolution in the future, it is universal compulsory military training. Can one look with equanimity upon training to the use of arms of the lower elements in our laboring classes, both white and Negro? What will strikes become if the strikers are trained in military methods? A population habituated to the use of arms and to military methods seldom has scruples against the use of armed force. Moreover, it is fatuous to think that the little patriotic civic instruction which might be sandwiched in with compulsory military training would suffice to stop the tendency of groups to achieve their ends by the use of the methods of armed force in which they had been instructed.

There is no argument for the adoption of such a system in the United States, in the fact that Switzerland with conscription has escaped involvement in wars and civil disturbances. It is a small country with a small population, wonderfully united through long tradition in its political ideals. Again, Switzerland has no other means of defense, and its neutrality is guaranteed by the surrounding hostile nations. It cannot protect itself with a navy. Finally, until the present war began, its term of military training was very short.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

A problem that is hard enough for Americans, and doubly hard for newcomers, is how to get away from the city for a time in the summer. The staff at Powell House are continually being asked for advice in this matter, and the needs of those who ask are varied. Some can afford to pay reasonably well; others must find a place where it is possible to meet all or part of the cost by helping in the house or the garden. Many of those who ask advice have come to America within the past four or five years and have never been outside of New York City.

The staff at Powell House would appreciate it if friends would send them the names and addresses of small inns, tourist homes, farms, or country places where paying guests would be welcome, either in the neighborhood of New York or Philadelphia or as far away as the Poconos, the Adirondacks, or New England. We should also like to hear from people who would be prepared to offer hospitality to one or more persons, be it for a few days or a period of weeks or months. Please send any suggestions to me at 130 East 70th Street, New York 21, N. Y.

ELIZABETH FRY

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

Race Problems

[*Following are excerpts from a letter from Bayard Rustin, co-secretary of the FOR Race Relations Department, now serving a three-year sentence in Ashland (Ky.) Federal Prison. In efforts to improve interracial relations within the prison, Bayard has achieved considerable success. He is now teaching a class of about 15 mountain whites in a course which he chooses to call "History, with the Emphasis on Music and Art."*]

As I review experiences here, with new force I see again the terrible decision many of our people face in their local communities—whether to put their energies into basic change (which often in effect means non-cooperation) or to follow a program of amelioration. There are, of course, good arguments on both sides, but at present with so few here prepared to act where racial equality is concerned, and in a situation in which Negroes are least prepared to act either with unity of purpose or with non-violence, I am convinced that a clear program of non-violent direct action education is most necessary. Non-violence actually is new to the point of creating fear in many areas. On the other hand there is in the situation from day to day ample material for illustration, inspiration, and in need of solution. Yet the forces which one opposes are by no means single. Even in situations in which the power-that-be takes the proper stand, there are present institutional jealousies, personal prejudice, fear and ignorance, all of which tend to obstruct and befuddle. And to becloud is no great problem where the basic concern is not for inner freedom, dignity or real equality, but rather for parole, favor and slight privilege.

The chief aim frequently is for that "freedom" (usually in some large urban center) in which again it will be possible to attack representatives of the "great white world," and thereby to relieve economic stress or to find emotional release. In bas-relief I see clearly now a violent pattern of violent avoidance which in the past was vague and academic. It is this—that a great deal of the criminal action of Negroes in this country is the result of a plan by which they seek to avoid "the great white world." The thought process is this: "I am weak and black in a world in which those who have all the power are white. I cannot go among them without psychological and physical hurt, without accepting a position of inferiority. So if I am to exist with emotional freedom and with some economic power, I must find them among my own groups. But since my own group offers little or no employment in legitimate business, I shall live by my wits then. I shall exploit 'brief case niggers' (meaning the well-trained but morally weak who have enough money to buy various forms of dope, homemade liquor, stolen goods, etc.). I shall become a confidence man or a pimp. I shall select several prostitutes and 'put them on the block.' In short I prefer to make my living by any means, even if it means chiseling my own exploited black brothers or sisters, before I shall shine the muddy shoes or wash the dirty linen of the 'white world'."

Here again the answer in part lies in the discovery of a new means by which the problem of economic security for Negroes can be faced rather than avoided.

BAYARD RUSTIN

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

These times are so kaleidescopic that none of us can foretell anything, but by putting emphasis on root and seed ideas and values—the things that are eternal—we will win through whatever typhoons, moral earthquakes and holocausts may come after the shooting stops. The returning soldiers and sailors will, I think, be predominantly cynical, violent, disillusioned, reactionary and desirous of creature comforts. But I also think that among them there will be a considerable number who still hunger for hope and better ways and who will respond to the FOR ideas. This group will enlarge, I suspect, after the depression that will follow the war. Suffering makes people search for deeper values and see wider and more distant horizons than in ordinary secure times. The bewilderment and confusion will be so great that many people will automatically turn for leadership to those who are sure and unshaken and who see a clear path out of trouble. We may not for a long time win political majorities, but we will more than hold our own; we will grow in numbers and power. Avanti! RICHARD GREGG

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.

Our Summer Menu provides a BALANCED DIET

of reading matter

for all who want to maintain a sane and comprehensive view of world affairs.

PEACE PAMPHLETS

War, Transition and Peace — $ .15
Latest joint statement of five major peace groups.

Political Theories of Pacifism — .25
New. By Mulford Sibley. Pacifist Research Bureau.

Coercion of States in Federal Unions — .25
By Harrop Freeman and Theodore Paullin.

Coercion of States in International Organizations — .25
By Harrop Freeman. Second of the series.

PROBLEMS OF WORLD PEACE

Peace Is the Victory — $1.50
Impressive symposium by leading Christian pacifists: Fosdick, Holmes, Muste and many others. Harpers.

Peace Through Cooperation — 1.25
J. Henry Carpenter. Cooperatives and the peace.

From Victory to Peace — 1.50
By Paul Hutchinson, Churches and problems of world peace.

Towards an Abiding Peace — 2.50
By MacIver. The price of a peace that will last.

PACIFIST IDEOLOGY

The Fall of Christianity — $1.50
By Heering. Profound discussion of church, state, and war.

The New Testament Basis of Pacifism — .50
By Macgregor. Scholarly and convincing study.

Pacifica Studies in Pacifism, Vol. II — .50
Symposium of eight articles by six able authors.

PACIFISM IN ACTION

Heroes of Good Will — $ .25
By Allan Hunter. Stories of those who made good will work.

White Corpuscles in Europe — .75
By Allan Hunter. Leaders of healing forces in Europe.

The Peace Team — .05
By Douglas Steere. Practical guide for local groups.

RACE PROBLEMS

The Races of Mankind — $ .10
Public Affairs Pamphlet. New Edition.

Outcasts! — .15
Caleb Foote's comprehensive picture of Japanese evacuation and relocation.

Humans in Bondage — .15
By Lillian Smith, author of "Strange Fruit."

Interracial Primer — .15
Bayard Rustin's practical guide to action.

Get Together Americans — 1.75
By Davis-DuBois. Intercultural community action.

Strange Fruit — 2.75
Lillian Smith's best-selling novel.

DEVOTIONAL

With the Master — $ .75
Vernier's beautiful, inspiring meditations.

Living Abundantly — 2.50
Kirby Page's newest devotional readings.

Reality of the Spiritual World — .25
By Thomas R. Kelly. Pendle Hill Pamphlet.

Testament of Devotion — 1.00
By Kelly. Highly recommended.

STUDYBOOKS

Pattern for Peacemakers
New Wars for Old
Exit Empire
The Next Peace

These popular but authoritative booklets are in demand for study classes and discussion groups as well as for personal reading. Both youth and adult editions. Others in the series soon to come. $ .25

VERA BRITTAIN'S

"Not Made in Germany"

Reprint of article in June *Fellowship*, replying to criticism of Wm. L. Shirer and the President on "Massacre by Bombing."

2¢ each—$1.50 per hundred

"Slaughter of the Innocent"

on the mass bombing of German cities.

2¢ each—$1.00 per hundred

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.